

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Docket Number (Optional)

16239-07171

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

on VIA EFS-WEB FROM PACIFIC TIME ZONE ON 9/27/07

Signature /Daniel R. Brownstone 46,581/

Typed or printed name Daniel R. Brownstone, Reg. No. 46581

Application Number

10/055,870

Filed

January 21, 2002

First Named Inventor

Michael Saucier

Art Unit

3629

Examiner

Jonathan P. Ouellette

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐ applicant/inventor.

/Daniel R. Brownstone 46581/

Signature

☐ assignee of record of the entire interest.

See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.
(Form PTO/SB/96)

Daniel R. Brownstone, Reg. No. 46581

Typed or printed name

☒ attorney or agent of record. 46581
Registration number

415-875-2358

Telephone number

☐ attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.

Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34

September 27, 2007

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.

Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below.

☐ *Total of _____ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 1.16. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Privacy Act Statement

The **Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579)** requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (*i.e.*, GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT(S): Michael Saucier, *et al.*
APPLICATION NO.: 10/055,870
FILING DATE: January 21, 2002
TITLE: System and Method For Facilitating Transactions Between Product
Brand Manager and Manufacturing Organizations
EXAMINER: Jonathan P. Ouellette
GROUP ART UNIT: 3629
ATTY. DKT. NO.: 16239-07171

CERTIFICATE OF EFS-Web Transmission			
Pursuant to 240 OG 45 and the <i>Legal Framework For EFS-Web</i> , I hereby certify that this follow-on correspondence is being officially submitted through the USPTO EFS-Web system from the Pacific Time Zone of the United States on the local date shown below.			
Signature:	/Daniel R. Brownstone 46581/		
Typed or Printed Name:	Daniel R. Brownstone	Dated:	September 27, 2007

MAIL STOP AF
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

REMARKS ACCOMPANYING
REQUEST FOR PRE-APPEAL BRIEF CONFERENCE

Claims 1-77 and 84 are pending and stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in view of Radjy et al. (US 2002/0010525 A1).

The claimed invention lets product brand managers discover information about which manufacturers possess the capability to manufacture a product brand, but holds the product brand information in confidence by not communicating it to the manufacturers, and preserving the manufacturing capabilities of the manufacturers in confidence by not disclosing to the product manager capabilities of those manufacturers not determined to be a match. Put another way, manufacturers do not know the product brand information, and

product brand managers do not know the manufacturers capabilities—the product brand managers know only that certain identified manufacturers have the capability needed for the product brand. This maximizes the confidentiality for both the product brand and manufacturing sides, since neither has to disclose their needs or capacity, respectively, to the other.

The Examiner has admitted that Radjy does not disclose the elements of claim 1. Radjy discloses a “concrete exchange” for providing feedback about concrete batch information to suppliers and purchasers. In the first of two ways described by Radjy for associating an AEC with a manufacturer, an AEC can “utilize the concrete exchange system to locate the necessary suppliers for his concrete on his own” (Radjy, [0130]). In an alternative arrangement, “the AEC may post a request for information . . . Then, a sales or technical services representative 516 from the target (prospective concrete manufacturer) company will preferably contact the AEC to discuss the project” ([0131]).

In each of the scenarios described by Radjy, either the AEC, the concrete manufacturers, or both are required to make known their needs and abilities to the other party in order to determine whether a match is possible. That is, there is no teaching in Radjy of “determining a set of candidate manufacturing organizations for the product brand . . . without providing the product brand information to the manufacturing organizations,” as claimed.

The Examiner’s response to this deficiency is that the difference between Radjy and the claimed invention is merely an automation step that “gives you just what you would expect from the manual step disclosed by Radjy (Para 0130)” (Final Office Action, p. 3). Such is not the case.

In the “manual step” of Radjy, the AEC sorts through the concrete exchange system to locate suppliers of interest. Necessarily, the AEC is reviewing details of the manufacturers’ production abilities in order to select which are of interest. Alternatively, the AEC can post a request for information (RFI) that is converted into a concrete exchange-based format and provided to the manufacturers. In both cases, information from one party is being shared with one or more of the other parties, either about production needs or production capabilities.

The claimed invention enables the matching of brand managers with manufacturing organizations without the broad disclosure of information required by Radjy. The set of candidate manufacturing organizations is determined “without providing the product brand information to the manufacturing organizations or the manufacturing process capabilities to the product brand managers”.

As described in Applicants’ written description, “communication of the product brand information often poses a risk of that information being compromised or misappropriated. If the product brand manager wishes to contact a number of manufacturing organizations to inquire about the possibility of enlisting them [to] undertake the manufacture, this typically will result in this sensitive information being placed in the hands of an actual or potential competitor” (Specification [0014]).

Thus, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion that “the end result is the same as compared to the manual method,” the use of the claimed method preserves sensitive information of the parties in greater confidence, directly addressing the problem identified above, and patentably distinct from what is taught by Radjy.

Dependent claims 2-77 are also patentable over Radjy, both because each recites its own patentable features, and because each depends from patentable claim 1.

Independent claim 84 is similarly patentable over Radjy. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Radjy does not disclose a “transactional computer system adapted to . . . make the selection of the at least one candidate manufacturing organization without providing the product brand information to the manufacturing organizations or the manufacturing organization information to the product brand manager” as claimed. Accordingly, claim 84 is patentable over Radjy and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,
MICHAEL SAUCIER *ET AL.*

Dated: September 27, 2007

By: /Daniel R. Brownstone 46,581/
Daniel R. Brownstone, Reg. No.: 46,581
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2358
Fax: (415) 281-1350
dbrownstone@fenwick.com